



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/578,218	05/03/2006	Katsuhiro Sasai	52433/847	8373
26646	7590	07/17/2008	EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON LLP ONE BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10004			ZHU, WEIPING	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		1793	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		07/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/578,218	SASAI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	WEIPING ZHU	1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 June 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-7 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/30/2007 and 5/3/2006</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

The application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.4999, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted

- I. Claims 1-4, drawn to a ultralow carbon thin gauge steel sheet.
- II. Claims 5-7, drawn to a method for producing the sheet.

The inventions listed as I-II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: the common technical feature in all groups is the steel sheet. This element cannot be a special technical feature under PCT Rules 13.2 because the element is shown in the prior art.

JP 06-065647 A discloses a steel sheet (abstract), which is substantially identical to the claimed steel sheet. Inventions I-II lack the same or corresponding special technical features. Therefore unity of invention is lacking and restriction is appropriate.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. John J. Kelly, Jr. on June 13, 2008 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of I, claims 1- 4. Affirmation of this election must be made by the applicant in replying to this Office

action. Claims 5-7 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should the applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, the applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

The applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1- 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 06-065647 A in view of JP 2003-268435 A.

With respect to claims 1-4, JP ('647 A) discloses a cold rolled steel sheet comprising by weight (abstract) less than 0.003% of C, less than 0.1% of Si, 0.05-0.4% of Mn, less than 0.05% of P, less than 0.05% of S, less than 0.004% of N, 0.02-0.1% of Ti, less than 0.06% of Al, 0.002-0.04% of Nb, 0.0001-0.001% of B and the balance of Fe and inevitable impurities.

JP ('647 A) does not disclose the steel sheet comprises La+Ce+Nd as claimed in the instant claim 1. However, it is noted that the instant claim 1 does not limit the contents of La, Ce and Nd individually, indicating that there is no limitation of the presence of all the three elements. Therefore, it is the examiner's interpretation that the presence of La, Ce or Nd in the claimed content range would meet the claim limitation of the content of La+Ce+Nd. JP ('435 A) discloses adding 0.0001-0.01 wt. % of Nd to thin steel sheets (abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add 0.0001-0.01 wt. % of Nd to the composition of JP ('647 A) as disclosed by JP ('435 A) in order to decompose the small amount of dissolved oxygen and TiO_n inclusion left in the steel melt after the Ti deoxidation as disclosed by JP ('435 A) (abstract).

JP ('647 A) does not limit the types of Ti and Al as claimed. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use claimed acid soluble Ti and Al with expected success, because JP ('647 A) discloses the same utility of all types of Ti and Al. See MPEP 2144.05 I. The content ranges of the elements of JP ('647 A) in view of JP ('435 A) overlap the claimed content ranges of the elements respectively. A *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. See MPEP 2144.05 I. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the claimed content ranges within the ranges of JP ('647 A) in view of JP ('435 A) with expected success, because JP ('647 A) in view of JP ('435 A) discloses the same utility over the entire disclosed ranges.

JP ('647 A) in view of JP ('435 A) does not disclose the structures of the steel sheet as claimed in the instant claims 1 and 2. However, it has been well held where the claimed and prior art products are identical or substantially identical in structure or composition, or are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, a *prima facie* case of either anticipation or obviousness has been established. *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252, 1255, 195 USPQ 430, 433 (CCPA 1977), MPEP 2112.01 [R-3] I. In the instant case, the claimed and JP ('647 A) in view of JP ('435 A)'s steel sheets are identical or substantially identical in composition and are produced by identical or substantially identical processes, therefore a *prima facie* case of obviousness exists. The same oxysulfites, the same average grain size of recrystallized grains and the same aspect ratio of the recrystallized grain size would be expected in the steel sheet of JP ('647 A) in view of JP ('435 A) as in the claimed steel sheet.

Conclusion

3. This Office action is made non-final. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Weiping Zhu whose telephone number is 571-272-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-16:30 Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Roy King/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 1793

WZ

Application/Control Number: 10/578,218

Art Unit: 1793

Page 7

6/19/2008